

REMARKS

I. Status of Application

By the present Amendment, new claims 40-43 have been added. Claims 1-28 and 34-43 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 29-33 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 1-28, 36 and 37 allowed. Claims 34, 35 and 38 presently stand rejected. Claim 39 is objected to.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 1-28, 36-37 are allowed.

Claim 39 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By the present Amendment, claim 39 has been amended to incorporate recitations of its base claim 38 and, therefore, Applicant submits that claim 39 is immediately allowable *at least* by virtue of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 34-35 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as allegedly being anticipated by Arai (U.S. Patent No. 5,517,319). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

A. Independent Claim 34

Nevertheless, without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, claim 34 has been amended, as set forth above, to recite (among other things):

...wherein the scanner outputs image data
which is larger than the copy target region and
encompasses the copy target region on the inside;
and

wherein the image processor generates the print data by enlarging the image data at a magnification adjusted so as to cause the image data of an outer portion, which is outside of the copy target region, to be out of the print medium.

Support for the amendments to claim 34 is provided by *at least* FIGS. 4 and 18 of the originally filed specification and the corresponding descriptions thereof. As shown according to an exemplary embodiment in FIG. 18, for example, the image data of an outer portion, which is outside of the copy target region is caused to be out of the print media 272. No new matter has been added.

Arai fails to disclose, or even remotely suggest, the above features and, therefore, claim 34 is not anticipated by Arai for *at least* these reasons. Indeed, the grounds of rejection allege that Arai's scanner 101 and image processor 102 correspond to the claimed scanner and image processor, respectively. However, the grounds of rejection set forth in the 02/10/09 Office Action fail to address the final two recitations of claim 34 (02/10/09 Office Action, page 3). For instance, the grounds of rejection make no attempt to point out any aspect of Arai that discloses or suggests the recitations on lines 9-11 of claim 34, "wherein the scanner outputs image data..." (*see* 02/10/09 Office Action, page 3). The grounds of rejection also make no attempt to identify any aspect of Arai that discloses or suggests the recitations on lines 12-14 of claim 34, "wherein the image processor generates the print data..." (*see* 02/10/09 Office Action, page 3).

To maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Examiner must establish that each and every element as set forth in claim 34 are found, either expressly or inherently described, in Arai (*see* MPEP §2131). Since the grounds of rejection fail to make any attempt to demonstrate that

the features of lines 9-14 of claim 34 are found in Arai, the grounds of rejection are improper for *at least* these reasons.

Further, claim 34 plainly requires the features of wherein the image processor generates the print data by enlarging the image data at a magnification adjusted so as to cause the image data of an outer portion, which is outside of the copy target region, to be out of the print medium. In sharp contrast to claim 34, Arai merely discloses that a conventional magnifier 103 in the image processor 102 enlarges and reduces the image read by the scanner 101 (column 2, lines 43-44). However, Arai nowhere discloses or suggests that the image processor 102 generates the print data to the printer 105 by enlarging the image data at a magnification adjusted so as to cause the image data of an outer portion, which is outside of the copy target region, to be out of the print medium, as claimed.

Therefore, claim 34 is not anticipated by Arai for *at least* these reasons and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

B. Independent Claim 35

In view of the similarity between the requirements of amended claim 35 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 34, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 34 demonstrate the patentability of claim 35. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 35 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above.

C. Independent Claim 38

Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, claim 38 has been amended, as set forth above, to recite (among other things):

...generating image data of a first region,
which comprises an inside region of the original
region from which an edge portion is eliminated
by a predetermined scanner margin...

The cited Arai reference fails to disclose or suggest these features and, thus, fails to anticipate claim 38 for *at least* these reasons. In contrast to claim 38, Arai discloses that data excluding the region in a vicinity of the edge of the original is obtained (*see e.g.*, FIG. 8). As shown in FIG. 8(a) of Arai, for instance, image data of the quarter upper right-hand area of the original document is written, but the region in a vicinity of the edge of the original document (e.g., the region in the vicinity of the edge in the remaining three quarters of the original document) is excluded. That is, Arai fails to disclose or suggest that image data, including the inside region in a vicinity of the edge of the original region is generated. Accordingly, Arai fails to disclose or suggest the features of generating image data of a first region, which comprises an inside region of the original region from which an edge portion is eliminated by a predetermined scanner margin, as claimed.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 38 is not anticipated by Arai for *at least* these reasons and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 10, 2009

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666